



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

he was employed. And the same is true as to slander. See *NEWELL, SLANDER AND LIBEL*, 3rd ed., 436. There seems to be no good reason for distinguishing slander from other willful torts. See *Hypes v. Southern Ry. Co.*, 82 S. C. 315, 64 S. E. 395, 21 L. R. A. (N. S.) 873.

CORPORATIONS—STOCKHOLDER'S SUITS—PLEADINGS.—A stockholder petitioned in equity in behalf of the corporation for remedial relief from the directors' alleged negligent mismanagement of the corporate property. The bill did not show either that the negligent directors controlled the corporation or that the petitioning stockholder had made sufficient application within the corporation to have that body, as the proper party, bring the suit. *Held*, a demurrer to the bill should be sustained. *Bartlett v. New York, N. H. & H. R. Co.* (Mass.), 109 N. E. 452. See NOTES, p. 62.

HIGHWAYS—NEGLIGENCE—LIABILITY OF COUNTIES AND COUNTY OFFICIALS.—The highway commissioners of defendant county negligently left one of its highways in a defective condition. Plaintiff's intestate was killed by reason of the defect, whereupon the plaintiff brought action both against the county and against the commissioners personally. *Held*, neither the county nor the commissioners are liable. *Snethen v. Harrison County* (Iowa), 152 N. W. 12. See NOTES, p. 56.

INSURANCE—FIRE INSURANCE—SUBROGATION OF INSURER.—The defendant insured, with the plaintiff company, certain mortgaged property against loss by fire, the policy being payable to the mortgagee as his interest might appear. The property was destroyed within the terms of the policy; and, having paid the mortgagee, the plaintiff claims subrogation to his rights against the mortgagor. *Held*, the insurer is not entitled to subrogation. *Milwaukee Ins. Co. v. Ramsey* (Ore.), 149 Pac. 542.

A fire insurance contract is strictly a contract of indemnity. *Hedger v. Union Ins. Co.*, 17 Fed. 498; *Chickasaw County Ins. Co. v. Weller*, 98 Ia. 731, 68 N. W. 443. And therefore, while the insured should be fully indemnified within the limits of the policy, he should never be allowed to profit by the loss. *Chickasaw County Ins. Co. v. Weller*, *supra*. It is on this theory that the insurer is, by the great weight of authority, subrogated to the mortgagee's rights against the mortgagor when the former insures his own interests separately; otherwise the insured mortgagee could collect his debts twice—both from the insurer and from the mortgagor. *Thornton v. Enterprise Ins. Co.*, 71 Pa. St. 234; *Ulster Co. Savings Inst. v. Leake*, 73 N. Y. 161, 29 Am. Rep. 115; *Susser Co. Mut. Ins. Co. v. Woodruff*, 26 N. J. L. 541.

Where, as in the principal case, the mortgagor procures the insurance at his own expense, designating the mortgagee as beneficiary, the authorities unanimously agree that the insurer is not entitled to subrogation, but that the amount paid the mortgagee goes to reduce the mortgage debt. This seems clearly correct, since the mortgagor should certainly have the benefit of a contract to which he is a party, and the consideration for which has been paid by him. *Pendleton v. Elliott*, 67 Mich. 496, 35 N. W. 97; *Pearman v. Gould*, 42 N. J. Eq. 4, 5 Atl. 811.